



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,541	11/02/2001	Victor Lu	3561-102	6064
20575	7590	12/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. 210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204			SERRAO, RANODHI N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2141		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/053,541	LU ET AL.	
	Examiner Ranodhi Serrao	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1-8 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Capps et al. (6,735,691) and Durham (6,330,566). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow. Upon careful consideration prior to allowance of the instant application, the examiner has found new references that read on the claimed invention. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps et al. (6,735,691) and Durham (6,330,566). Capps et al. teaches a method for tracking and reporting traffic activity on a web site (see Capps et al., col. 7, line 58-col. 8, line 15) comprising the steps of: storing a web page on a first server coupled to a wide area network, said web page having web page code and data mining code (see Capps et al., col. 10, lines 6-47); uploading the web page to a visitor computer responsive to a request over the wide area network from the visitor computer (see Capps et al., col. 3, lines 28-43); and operating the data mining code on the visitor computer to obtain web browsing data (see Capps et al., col. 7, line 58-col. 8, line 15). But fails to teach a cookie processing script; operating the cookie processing script at the visitor computer on the web browsing data to obtain new cookie values; and storing the new cookie on

the visitor computer including the new cookie values. However, Durham teaches a cookie processing script (see Durham, col. 3, lines 22-41); operating the cookie processing script at the visitor computer on the web browsing data to obtain new cookie values; and storing the new cookie on the visitor computer including the new cookie values (see Durham, col. 3, lines 42-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Capps et al. to a cookie processing script; operating the cookie processing script at the visitor computer on the web browsing data to obtain new cookie values; and storing the new cookie on the visitor computer including the new cookie values in order to by caching in a client-stored cookie a globally unique client id (GUID) along with a core set of user data (such as preferences) generally applicable to the user's interaction with a server (see Durham, col. 3, lines 5-21).

4. Claims 2, 3, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps et al. and Durham as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pogue et al. 6,112,240.

5. As per claim 2, Capps et al. and Durham teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fails to teach a method, further comprising the step of receiving the new cookie values at a second server. However, Pogue et al. teaches a method, further comprising the step of receiving the new cookie values at a second server (see Pogue et al., col. 8, lines 52-59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Capps et al. and Durham to a method, further

comprising the step of receiving the new cookie values at a second server in order to obtain client information relating to a web page in a World Wide Web site by utilizing a tracker tag in the code of the web page for initiating a client information tracking program (see Pogue et al., col. 2, lines 12-26).

6. As per claims 2, 3, and 5-8, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 1 applies fully in order to combine Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham.

7. As per claim 3, Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham teach a method, further including the steps of: attaching the new cookie values to an image request associated with a designated URL source; and sending the image request to the URL source (see Pogue et al., col. 7, lines 11-22).

8. As per claim 5, Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham teach a method, further including the steps of: compiling the web browsing data into a web page traffic report; and posting the report for viewing over the wide area network (see Pogue et al., col. 4, lines 30-60).

9. As per claim 6, Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham teach a method, wherein the step of generating a new cookie includes the step of operating the cookie processing script on an old cookie associated with the web page and previously stored on the visitor computer (see Pogue et al., col. 7, lines 11-22).

10. As per claim 7, Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham teach a method, further including the step of overwriting the old cookie with the new cookie (see Pogue et al., col. 7, lines 11-22).

11. As per claim 8, Capps et al., Pogue et al., and Durham teach a method, further including the steps of: detecting that an old cookie exists on the visitor computer associated with the web site; tracking events on the visitor computer; processing the old cookie using cookie processing code in view of the tracked events to obtain new cookie values; and replacing the old cookie values with the new cookie values (see Pogue et al., col. 6, line 52-col. 7, line 22).

12. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps et al. and Durham as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Shrader et al. (6,374,359). Capps et al. and Durham teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1-3 above but fail to teach a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data. However, Shrader et al. teaches a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data (see Shrader et al., col. 2, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Durham and Capps et al. to a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data in order to provide an architecture for the dynamic use and validation of HTTP cookies for authentication by an application running on a web server (see Shrader et al., col. 1, lines 62-65).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER